Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

COMMEMORATION OF VICTORIES.—The Romans would never decree a triumph for victories, however signal or beneficent, won over their own citizens. An example worthy of universal imitation; and we are glad to find it stated that the King of Prussia has isued an order forbidding the further anniversary of the great victory of Sadowa, on the ground that it was a victory of Germans over Germans. What a rebuke from pagan Rome and monarchcial Prussia to republican, reputedly Christian America for the general fervor of zeal among us for decorating the graves of those who fell in our late rebellion, whether loyalist or rebel, whether fighting to repress or to perpetrate crime, and expending millions of treasure in the aggregate to raise monuments to their memory. If a given neighborhood in New England should have a bloody feud in which some scores or hundreds fell stained with fraternal blood, would it be Christian or wise to perpetuate the memory of such an event by eulogies and granite monuments?

THE PRESENT STATE OF PEACE. — The world has seldom known a period of more profound peace than that which now prevails. Not only are there no wars, but at present no rumors of war. The Emperor Napoleon is feeble, the King of Prussia is old, the Emperor of Austria is engaged in domestic reforms, the Czar is resting on his laurels, the King of Italy is satisfied with what he has already obtained, and Spain ought to have enough on her hands without entering into foreign broils. Even the eternal "Eastern question," save for the spurt about Egypt, is quiet for a while, and neither Greece nor Turkey is in a fighting mood. Nothing in particular is going on in Asia. The United States are as little disposed to a belligerent policy as we are; and although we hear of battles every now and then in South America, the thing is so far off as to seem almost like an echo from some other world. The war in Paraguay, the insurrection in Cuba, and the revolt in New Zealand, pretty well exhaust the martial facts of the day. The gates of the Temple of Janus are nearly closed; and if peace be a debauching influence, as some maintain, we now stand a very good chance of being corrupted. It would of course be too much to assume that this state of things will last forever, or even for many years. It cannot be expected. Unfortunately, the world abounds in causes of quarrel, and the old hot blood is not yet entirely removed from human veins. But it is nevertheless very obvious that the tendency of modern civilization is towards dispensing as much as possible with the favourite argument of kings. Not merely a finer sense of humanity, but a clearer perception of self-interest, inclines nations more and more every day to a reasonable rather than a violent settlement of disagreements. After all that has been said by cynics glad to throw discredit on human progress, and the hopes of men, about the failure of the prophecies of peace uttered in connection with the Great Exhibition of 1851, it is certain that the public opinion of the civilized world on this subject is better now than it was even twenty years ago. Dissensions which would formerly have led to war, are now settled by mediation; and kings and peoples are alike growing wiser with increasing knowledge and growing intercommunication. — *London News.*

THE LAST IMPROVEMENT IN THE ART OF WAR.—The genius of Prussia, inspired from hell, invented the needle-gun, that of France followed with her chassepote, and at length comes from England the report of "a new bayonet, a combined saw and sword. The sword-edge will cut a sheep into joints, and the saw-edge will easily saw the shin bone of an ox. This weapon is proposed not only for the British infantry, but for the Irish constabulary. It is believed that it can be improved by pointing it with a detonating cap which will explode inside a man's body, blowing him into minute fragments, and thus saving the expenses of gathering and burying the dead, and the delays occcasioned by flags of truce for these purposes on battle fields!"

LANGE ON WAR.

A SPECIMEN OF GERMAN THINKING.—His latest work is on *War and Victory*, and consists of three elaborate lectures, delivered before different German audiences. The first two were suggested by the great Prussian victory of 1866, though but little time is spent on this special subject. His object is to strip war of its gloss, to hold up the murderous thing to Christian contempt and indignation, and yet to indicate how God has made it serve good ends in the course of history. There is, throughout the work, the same psychological and poetical undertone which one finds in nearly all Dr. Lange's works, even the most abstruse.

"It is absurd to suppose that war is an unchangeable and natural necessity for the development of the human race. We are continually referred to the analogy of the conflicts of beasts, thereby to the bloody preservation of equilibrium in the brute world. But this is a false argument. When one beast takes the life of another, we have, at most, the example of a human hunter or butcher, and such things as conflicts between ants and birds have no reference to man, who is called to a definite purpose—to form a part of God's kingdom, which kingdom is one of eternal peace. The State and the Church constitute the two members of an antithesis which was united in the Old Testament theocracy. The theocratic Church was a community of faith and of population. As a community of faith it had the weapon of the divine word, and as a popular community, it had the weapon of the sword. In the former respect, the Old Testament Church was the type of the real Church, and in the latter, it was the type of the State, which bears the sword. Therefore, those are not true Christians who would throw off the State, and are only bastard descendants of the Old Testament Church, which was both Church and State. The Christian State belongs to God's kingdom, but it is not the grand organ of God's kingdom as the Church is.

The State is morally and legally a popular community, at whose fountain lie the moral nature and impulse of a people. Its first thought, therefore, its first power, its first duty, its first blessing, is law. With law it must stand or fall. War, like every historical expression of human life, rests upon a two-fold principle,—on original power of heart, on strength and its elaboration; in short, on the dynamical and technical principle!

There is such a thing as *holy* war; but it very seldom occurs, and is only such when conducted by the spirit of true faith and human philanthropy. The important question is "Why has God endowed man with important military talents; talents which are clearly designed for warfare, as in the case of Alexander, Cæsar, Napoleon, Wellington, Blucher and Grant? Not that war might be carried on to a large extent, but that its dimensions might be really reduced. The impulse to fight, which is now in the world, would be ten-fold greater if it were not controlled, inspired and dignified by military talent. It is a fact, which history clearly proves, that wars have been mollified and abridged by great campaigns. Therefore, mankind, since it is warlike by nature, should be profoundly grateful to God for the bestowment of special military talents! If weask, what place military talents could occupy in an ideal world or in heaven, the picture of the archangel Michael with a sword may give a preliminary answer. Beyond this world there will be labor and conflicts, but they will be such as are consistent with a state of spotless purity and happiness. The military talents on earth, being transferred to heaven, will undergo a transtformation common to that of the body.—*N. Y. Methodist.*

Strange mixture of sense and nonsense! The good ends that God secures by war! Just as he makes even sin and the devil subservient to his wise and gracious purposes. Shall we, therefore, excuse sin and glorify Satan? The betrayal of Christ in the garden led to his atoning sacrifice on the cross, and thus opened the way for the salvation of our race. Do we therefore make Judas the greatest of all saints, and hold up his damning offense to the admiration of the universe? Such is the logic that justifies or tolerates war. "Profoundly grateful to God for his bestowment of

military talents"! Thank God for the Alexanders, and Genghis-Khan, and Attilas, and Napoleons, those ravagers of continents, and wholesale butchers of mankind! As well thank God for the devil and his allies in sin and mischief.—Military talents in heaven! Saints and angels going to fight there, and turn it into a battle-field, a central Aceldama for the universe? Where will the revolting absurdities of war-logic end?

MURDER AS A FANATICISM.

There is said to be in Russia a sect who believe in assassination as a religious duty or merit, an offering agreeable to God. They have committed so many murders that the government has been forced in defence of society to take measures for their suppression.

This strange delusion is by no means new. On the conquest of India the British found there a religious sect whose peculiar mission or vocation was to commit murder. They secured their livelihood by assassination. It was a matter of both religion and business. One of the sacred Hindoo books is devoted to the sect, and with minute accuracy describes their creed and their practice. We can hardly credit it or conceive the existence of such a sect; but the main facts are well authenticated. It is said that they murdered not from malice, nor for the sake of plunder, but *from religious motives.* A religion of blood; men killed without malice, solely to please the great Father of all!

We know only one match to this strange and horrid delusion—*the custom of war.* Is not the war-system, now kept up in every Christian land, a fair and pretty full counterpart to this thuggism? There are millions of men in Christendom, supported at an expense of hundreds and thousands of millions of money, whose profession and whole business it is to kill men, not on their own account or pleasure, but at the arbitrary bidding of their rulers. They protest, like Hindoo thugs, that they commit the crimes of war, its wholesale robberies and murders, from no malice or selfish motives, but as a matter of duty in obedience to their rulers! They say they have no responsibility in the case they just do the deeds of violence, blood and vengeance which they are commanded to do.

Such is the *Thuggism of War.* And is it not akin to the bloody, remorseless fanaticism of Russia and Hindoostan? What valid warrant can there be for either system in Christianity, reason or common sense? Yet this system of blood, inherited from pagan barbarism, is still continued under our religion of peace, with little disposition anywhere to call in question either its necessity or its propriety!

LOOSE LOGIC.—"When the Cubans are sufficiently consolidated to be recognized as an armed force, representing organized military and civil power, and holding possession of a province, or some leading city, then the force of public opinion in the United States will demand recognition."

So says a Boston journal that claims a very wide circulation and great influence. But in such talk is there any principle, reason or common sense? The Cuban rebels are trampling under foot all the laws of the government over them, wholesale violators of law; and can it be right for our government, or any other, to abet or in any way aid them in committing such crimes?

We know well the excuse — *they are revolutionists.* True; but can this plea alter the question of right, or prove that they are *not* committing such crimes? Does any government permit or excuse such crimes? Can it and live? It is conceded on all hands that such deeds of violence and blood as the Cuban rebels are now perpetrating, would be inexcusably wrong unless they have "an armed force, and possession of a province or some leading city." What a criterion of right! Can ability to commit crime with success or impunity, make such crimes right and praiseworthy? If a large number of men raise an army, get possession of one or more considerable cities, and thus acquire power to commit robbery, murder and all manner of crimes on a gigantic scale, should we think all this would make it right for our government, or any other, to recognize them as rightful belligerents and an independent nation? True, England and France conceded belligerency to our rebels; but did we think then, or do we now, that they were right? Did not England burn her own fingers by so doing? May not we burn ours by meddling with the Cuban imbroglio? Alas! how little conscience, consistency or common sense in the intercourse of nations.

BISHOP WILBERFORCE ON WAR.—"I can hardly conceive," he says, in a recent sermon before a Missionary Society, "a more miserable circumstance for the whole civilized world, and for the whole Christian Church, than that through the evil passions of men these two great countries (England and the United States) should be driven into war. We ought to be at peace; our interests are one; we are both the great witnesses for liberty; we are both the great witnesses for national freedom. If we should be diverted from advancing these blessings throughout the world by a mutual hostility one to the other, it would be one of those deep judgments of which we read in the blackest pages of past history as having been allowed to overshadow humanity; and yet we see how one single utterance of one man, whose temper is not under perfect control, has been permitted to electrify a great continent and endanger the peaceful relations of two mighty empires."

PEACE SENTIMENT IN FRANCE.—It is only germinating there among the people after ages of an intense war-mania. "It is incontestably true," as Frederic Passey says, "that the influence of our ideas has increased considerably within some months. Within a week even, on the occasion of the election of our representatives, one could see, without exaggeration, that the cry, *down with war*, had considerable influence. Every one of the candidates declared energetically in favor of Peace, the reduction of the army, and the diminution of the Budget of War. This is the best proof of the popularity of these ideas. We have not the presumption to attribute the honor of this change to our efforts entirely; but we should do injustice to ourselves, and the friends of the cause, if we did not say that our efforts had contributed towards this end. This result was not so much from the real sentiments of the candidates as it was the progress of public opinion."